

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Christine Margaret Thompke,	)	C.A. No. 3:07-1079-TLW-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Richland County et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

The Plaintiff brought this *pro se* action against the Defendants, alleging certain civil rights violations. On May 7, 2007, the Plaintiff made a motion to disqualify Magistrate Judge Thomas Rogers and apparently the undersigned. The Plaintiff has previously filed motions to disqualify Magistrate Judge Rogers. *See* Order issued October 26, 2007. On January 31, 2008, United States Magistrate Judge Thomas Rogers, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), filed a Report and Recommendation (“the Report”). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the Defendants’ motion be denied. The Plaintiff objected to the Magistrate’s Report on February 25, 2008.

This Court is charged with reviewing the Magistrate’s report and the Plaintiff’s objections thereto. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and

Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate's Report and the record in this case. This Court concludes that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 57), and that the Defendants' motion for disqualification is **DENIED** (Doc. # 13).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

S/ Terry L. Wooten  
**TERRY L. WOOTEN**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

March 5, 2008

Florence, South Carolina